

April 25, 1894.—Dr. Henry Woodward, F.R.S.,
President, in the Chair.

The following communication was read:—

‘On a new *Goniatite* from the Lower Coal Measures.’ By
Herbert Bolton, Esq., F.R.S.E.

Sowerby in his ‘Mineral Conchology’ figures two fossils under the name of *Goniatites Listeri*, of which the left-hand figure is clearly *G. Listeri*, whilst the right-hand one differs considerably from it. The Author gives diagnoses of *Goniatites Listeri* and of a new species, which agrees with the form represented in Sowerby’s right-hand figure. This species is limited to the shales forming the roof of the ‘Bullion’ or Upper Foot seam of the Lower Coal Measures, whilst *G. Listeri* ranges from the Lower Limestone Shales to the ‘Bullion’ seam.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The Ornithological Writings of Victor Lopez Seoane.

To the Editors of the ‘Annals and Magazine of Natural History.’

GENTLEMEN,—The following three pamphlets by this author have fallen into my hands:—(1) “Sur deux nouvelles formes de *Perdrix d’Espagne*,” *Mém. Soc. Zool. France*, vii. 1894, p. 92 &c.; (2) ‘Aves nuevas de Galicia’ [Svo], La Coruña, 1870, 10 pp.; (3) ‘Revision del Catalogo de las Aves de Andalucia’ [Svo], La Coruña, 1870, 18 pp. The last two bear the imprint—La Coruña (Imprenta y estereotipia de Vicente Abad (7—Plaza de Maria Pita—7) 1870.

With the first of these I have no quarrel, but the dates of the last two are open to grave suspicion. Indeed, when they reached me the ink in which they were printed was apparently fresh and easily smeared. The most awkward point, however, is the fact that M. Seoane refers in one of them to the ‘Catalogue of the Birds in the British Museum’ as “con preciosas [*sic*] descripciones, completa sinonimia, y algunas admirables láminas.” The first volume of this work did not appear until 1874, or *four* years after the supposed date of M. Seoane’s pamphlet.

The point at issue seems to be this: Mr. Howard Saunders published in 1872 (*Proc. Zool. Soc.* p. 153) a new species of Green Woodpecker from Spain (*Gecinus Sharpi*), and on seeing this description, presumably for the first time, M. Seoane has published at least one pre-dated pamphlet, in which he calls the bird *G. viridis galliciensis*, in order to gain priority. Curiously enough, the fact that M. Seoane has decided to describe these as new is noted in the French pamphlet (1) of 1894, and therein he refers to a Spanish pamphlet of 1891—‘Examen critico de las Perdices de Europa y particularmente de las des España’: Coruña, 1891. Is this the first intended title for ‘Aves nuevas,’ or shall we receive the ‘Examen critico’ when the ink is dry?

A similar example of this pre-dating is seen in the case of Reichenow’s *Perdix hispaniensis*, a species which Seoane includes in his 1870 pamphlet ‘Aves nuevas’ under the name of *Perdix cinerea charrela*; and a still earlier example was pointed out by Boulenger (*Zool. Record*, 1885, Rept. p. 2), in which it is shown that Seoane

endeavoured to anticipate Bedriaga over the nomenclature of a reptile by a falsely dated pamphlet.

I have unfortunately had to call attention in the 'Annals' to more than one case of dishonest methods to obtain priority; but this seems to me to be the most glaring example yet brought to light.

C. DAVIES SHERBORN

(Index gen. et spec. anim.).

On Bees and Honeysuckles. By THOMAS MEEHAN.

I was interested to-day (June 18th) in noting that while a few honey-bees persistently collected nectar from the mouths of honeysuckles, by far the larger number collected from the fallen flowers only.

The plant was *Lonicera japonica*, in the two forms known in gardens as *L. brachypoda* and *L. flexuosa*, both intertwining and flowering together. I have in the past satisfied myself that a bee which starts from the hive for pollen pays no attention to gathering nectar, while the one looking for nectar collects that only. Whether this is the course of labour for that trip from the hive only, or whether these particular tasks occupy the whole day or more, may be an interesting question. I had never noted bees collecting nectar from fallen flowers, indeed had not noted that fallen flowers had nectar; so that the attention of the bees to them gave the subject a double interest.

The flowers are white when freshly opened, the next day yellowish, the following they wither slightly and fall. Large numbers are collected by the leaves, on which they mostly lie till they turn brown and shrivel completely. Those which were badly shrivelled seemed preferable to the bees.

On cutting across the tube of a white corolla near the base, and then gently stripping the flower downwardly, a large globule of nectar protrudes. The same process executed on the older or yellow flower gives about the same quantity, as also does the faded flower of the third day. In the dried flower, taken before much shrivelling had occurred, nearly as much nectar was found. The completely shrivelled and twisted flower could not be "stripped" of its secretion in this way, but it was certainly present and as abundant. The bees carefully sought what would have been the mouth of the corolla, and then extracted the sweets from that point. It soon became evident that the shrivelling and contracting of the tube of the corolla acted in the same manner as the thumb-nail and finger in "stripping," lessening the diameter of the tube, and forcing the nectar towards the mouth and within the reach of the visiting insect.

As noted, the bees collecting nectar from these dead flowers never visited the fresh opening ones, while the few visiting the fresh flowers never visited the dead or dying ones; a very careful watch of half an hour satisfied me on this point. It was noted that the latter took considerable time and much laboured effort with each flower. There was an average of fifteen seconds to each flower, a very long time for the average honey-making bee. Those working on